

REMARKS

Claims 1, 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Nishiyama (US 6,107,685).

5 Claims 1, 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Juso et al. (US 6,265,783).

Claims 1, 5-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lin et al. (US 5,216,278).

10 Claims 1, 5-8, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kumazawa et al. (US 5,569,960).

Claims 2-4, 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (Kumazawa et al. or Lin et al.) in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (figs.1 and 4).

15 Claims 14-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over (Kumazawa et al. or Lin et al.) in view of Pu et al. (US 6,350,669).

20 Claims 17, 20-22, 28-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pu et al. in view of Kumazawa et al.

Claims 18-19, 23-26, 30-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kumazawa et al. in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art (figs.1 and 4).

25

1. Response to the rejection of claims 1, 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

30 Nishiyama teaches a package with **three different sizes of solder pads** (Fig.1A, & col. 7, lines 40-49), but only **two sizes of solder pads** are disclosed in the amended claim 1 of the present application. Although

Nishiyama also discloses a package with two different sizes of solder pads in Fig.2A, the structure on the corner region is different from the present invention. Nishiyama never disclose two features of the present invention, "a structure with two sizes of solder pads" and "the bigger solder pads are positioned on the corner region". So reconsideration of claims 1 and 6-8 is therefore politely requested.

2. Response to the rejection of claims 1, 5-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

Juso et al. teach two sizes of solder pads arranged in a matrix, and Juso et al. further disclose that the smaller solder pads are surrounded by the bigger solder pads (Fig.2 & Fig.4). However, Juso et al. fail to disclose the feature of "the bigger solder pads are only positioned on the corner region", which is disclosed in the amended claim 1 of the present application. Thus, the amended claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Juso et al., and reconsideration of claims 1 and 5-8 is therefore politely requested.

Lin et al. teach a plurality of solder pads with the same diameter. That is, Lin et al. neither disclose nor teach the feature of "a structure with two sizes of solder pads", which is disclosed in the amended 1 of the present application. Therefore, the amended claim 1 is patentably distinguishable from Lin et al., and reconsideration of claims 1 and 5-8 is therefore politely requested.

3. Response to the rejection of claims 1, 5-8 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b):

5 The difference between the amended claim 1 of the present application and Kumazawa et al.'s disclosure is pointed out in the Response filed on 03 September 2003. The solder pads taught by Kumazawa et al. must have at least five kinds of diameters (column 6, lines 35-39), but the solder pads disclosed in the amended
10 claim 1 of the present application have only two kinds of diameters. Therefore, the structure taught in the present application should be definitely different from that disclosed in Kumazawa et al.'s disclosure. Reconsideration of claims 1, 5-8, 16 is hereby
15 requested.

**4. Response to the rejection of claims 2-4, 9-13 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kumazawa et al. or Lin et al. in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art, the rejection
20 of claims 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kumazawa et al. or Lin et al. in view of Pu et al., and the rejection of claims 18-19, 23-26, 30-33 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Kumazawa et al. in view of Applicant Admitted Prior Art:**

25

According to the statement of the MPEP Sec. 2143.03, which is repeated as follows:

30 *"If an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C.103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious. (In re Fine, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ (CCPA 1988))"*

Claims 2-4, 9-13 and 14-15 are dependent on amended claim 1 and should be allowed if the amended claim 1 is non-obvious. Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 2-4, 9-13 and 14-15 is therefore
5 requested.

Claims 18-19, 23-26 and 30-33 are dependent on amended claim 17 and should be allowed if the amended claim 17 is non-obvious. Reconsideration of the
10 rejection of claims 18-19, 23-26 and 30-33 is therefore requested.

**5. Response to the rejection of claims 17, 20-22 and 28-29 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Pu et al. in view
15 of Kumazawa et al.:**

The structure disclosed in the amended claim 17 is a substrate with solder pads positioned on both surfaces. The references, Pu et al. and Kumazawa et al., only disclosed a single-side substrate. These two
20 references never disclosed or suggested the desirability of a substrate with solder pads positioned on both surfaces.

25 According to the statement of the MPEP Sec. 2141, which is repeated as follows:

"(B) The references must be considered as a whole and must suggest the desirability and thus the obviousness of making the combination;"

30

Reconsideration of the rejection of claims 17, 20-22 and 28-29 is therefore requested.

Sinc rely,

5 Winston Hsu Date: 2/17/2004

Winston Hsu, Patent Agent No. 41,526

P.O. BOX 506

Merrifield, VA 22116

U.S.A.

10 e-mail : winstonhsu@naipo.com.tw

(Please contact me by e-mail if you need a telephone
communication and I will return your call promptly.)